



**VARIATION IN THE DIGESTION OF ENERGY
BY BROILER CHICKENS**

By

Robert James Hughes

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Discipline of Animal Science

Faculty of the Sciences

The University of Adelaide

21 May, 2003

Table of Contents

Tables.....	viii
Figures.....	x
Abstract.....	xv
Declaration.....	xvii
Dedication.....	xviii
Acknowledgments.....	xix
Publications associated with the thesis	xx
Abbreviations.....	xxi
Chapter 1. Literature Review	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Factors influencing energy metabolism in chickens.....	3
1.2.1 Gut structure	4
1.2.2 Passage of digesta	7
1.2.3 Digestion and absorption.....	8
1.2.4 Microflora.....	11
1.2.5 Barrier function.....	14
1.2.6 Summary	15
1.3 Properties of feed that affect energy metabolism in poultry.....	16
1.3.1 Anti-nutritive properties of non-starch polysaccharides (NSP).....	16
1.3.2 NSP in cereal grains.....	17
1.3.3 NSP in legumes and oilseeds.....	18
1.3.4 Exogenous enzymes for degrading NSP	19
1.3.5 Anti-nutritive properties of feed other than NSP.....	20
Mycotoxins.....	21
Tannins.....	21
Protease inhibitors.....	22
α -Amylase inhibitors.....	23
Urease.....	23
Phyto-haemagglutinins.....	23

	Bioactive proteins, peptides and amino acids	24
1.4	Summary	25
Chapter 2. Influence of gut structure on digestion of energy by		
	broiler chickens	26
2.1	General introduction.....	26
2.2	Effects of gross structure of the gastrointestinal tract on AME of commercial broiler feed.....	27
2.2.1	Introduction.....	27
2.2.2	Materials and methods	28
	Birds, housing and management	28
	AME measurement and collection of intestinal tissues	29
	Serology	30
	Statistics	30
2.2.3	Results.....	31
2.2.4	Discussion.....	35
2.2.5	Conclusions.....	36
2.3	Effects of morphology of the small intestinal epithelium on AME of commercial broiler feed.....	36
2.3.1	Introduction.....	36
2.3.2	Materials and methods.....	37
	Birds, housing and management	37
	Collection of intestinal tissue and histology	38
	Serology	38
	Statistics	39
2.3.3	Results.....	39
2.3.4	Discussion.....	43
2.3.5	Conclusion	44
2.4	General discussion.....	44
2.5	Conclusions	44

Chapter 3. Variable responses in digestion of energy from a wheat-based diet are associated with sex and strain of chicken and morphology of the small intestinal mucosa 46

3.1	Introduction	46
3.2	Material and methods.....	47
3.2.1	Birds, housing and management	47
3.2.2	AME procedures, digesta collection and measurement of viscosity ..	48
3.2.3	Statistical analysis.....	49
3.3	Results	50
3.4	Discussion	55
3.5	Conclusions.....	57

Chapter 4. Breath tests as non-invasive indicators of digestive function of broiler chickens and metabolic activity of gut microflora..... 58

4.1	General introduction.....	58
4.2	Development of equipment and methods for collecting breath samples from chickens	60
4.2.1	Introduction.....	60
4.2.2	Helmets for collecting breath samples from chickens	61
4.2.3	Development of methodology for the use of helmets.....	61
4.2.4	Proof of the concept of breath testing chickens	62
Introduction.....		62
Materials and methods		63
Birds, housing and management.....		63
Experimental procedures		63
Results and discussion		64
Conclusion		65
4.3	Measurement of hydrogen and methane in breath samples from chickens.....	67
4.3.1	Introduction.....	67
4.3.2	Materials and methods.....	67
Birds, housing and management		67

Experimental procedures.....	68
Hydrogen and methane in expired air from chickens given a normal diet.....	68
Hydrogen and methane in expired air following ingestion of lactulose.....	68
4.3.3 Results and discussion.....	69
4.3.4 Conclusions.....	71
4.4 Development of breath tests based on hydrogen for measuring transit time of digesta and metabolic activity of gut microflora in chickens	71
4.4.1 Introduction.....	71
4.4.2 Materials and methods.....	72
Birds, housing and management	72
Sampling of breath.....	73
4.4.3 Results and discussion	73
4.4.4 Conclusions.....	75
4.5 General discussion and conclusions.....	76

**Chapter 5. Effects of rate of passage of digesta on the digestion of
energy in chickens..... 77**

5.1 General introduction.....	77
5.2 Relationship between oro-caecal transit time and whole tract transit time.....	78
5.2.1 Introduction.....	78
5.2.2 Materials and methods.....	79
Birds, housing and management	79
Estimation of whole-tract transit time and oro-caecal transit time.....	80
Sampling of breath.....	80
Statistics	80
5.2.3 Results.....	81
5.2.4 Discussion.....	84
5.2.5 Conclusions.....	85
5.3 Relationship between whole tract transit time and AME value of wheat	86

5.3.1	Introduction.....	86
5.3.2	Materials and methods.....	87
	Birds, housing and management	87
	Experimental diets and AME procedures	87
	Estimation of whole-tract transit time.....	88
	Statistics	88
5.3.3	Results.....	89
5.3.4	Discussion.....	91
5.3.5	Conclusions.....	93
5.4	General discussion and conclusions.....	93

Chapter 6. Influence of gut microflora on digestive function of broiler chickens95

6.1	General introduction.....	95
6.2	Metabolic activity of gut microflora in male and female chickens of two different strains given a diet based on low AME wheat.....	96
	6.2.1 Introduction.....	96
	6.2.2 Materials and methods.....	97
	6.2.3 Statistics.....	97
	6.2.4 Results.....	98
	6.2.5 Discussion	100
	6.2.6 Conclusions.....	102
6.3	Effects of NSP-degrading enzymes on AME of wheat and metabolic activity of gut microflora.....	102
	6.3.1 Introduction.....	102
	6.3.2 Material and methods.....	103
	6.3.3 Statistics.....	104
	6.3.4 Results.....	104
	6.3.5 Discussion.....	105
	6.3.6 Conclusions.....	106
6.4	Effects of age of chicken and exogenous enzymes on AME and metabolic activity of gut microflora of chickens given wheat and barley diets	107

6.4.1	Introduction.....	107
6.4.2	Materials and methods.....	108
	Birds, housing and management	108
	Experimental procedures.....	108
	Statistics	109
6.4.3	Results.....	109
6.4.4	Discussion.....	114
6.4.5	Conclusions.....	115
6.5	Effects of antibiotics in the feed on the site of digestion of carbohydrate from different types of grain.....	116
6.5.1	Introduction.....	116
6.5.2	Materials and methods.....	116
	Statistics	118
6.5.3	Results.....	118
6.5.4	Discussion	123
6.5.5	Conclusions.....	124
6.6	Synthesis of NSP-degrading enzymes by gut microflora in chickens given wheat and barley diets	125
6.6.1	Introduction.....	125
6.6.2	Materials and methods.....	125
	Birds, housing and management	125
	Experimental diets and AME measurement.....	126
	Collection and measurement of digesta and excreta	127
	Statistics	127
6.6.3	Results.....	127
6.6.4	Discussion.....	130
6.6.5	Conclusions.....	130
6.7	General discussion and conclusions.....	131
Chapter 7. General discussion and summary		133
7.1	Introduction	133
7.2	Influence of gut structure on digestion of energy by broiler chickens	134

7.3	Variable responses in digestion of energy from a wheat-based diet are associated with sex and strain of chicken and morphology of the small intestinal mucosa.....	135
7.4	Breath tests as non-invasive indicators of digestive function of broiler chickens and metabolic activity of gut microflora	135
7.5	Effects of rate of passage of digesta on the digestion of energy in chickens	136
7.6	Influence of gut microflora on digestive function of broiler chickens.....	136
7.7	Key determinants of variation in the digestion of energy by broiler chickens.....	139
7.8	Summary and Conclusions.....	140
7.9	Recommendations	142
Appendices		146
Appendix 1.	Descriptions of rearing pens.....	146
Appendix 2.	Description of metabolism cages	147
Appendix 3.	Calculation of dry matter digestibility, apparent metabolisable energy (AME) and ileal digestible energy (DE).....	148
Appendix 4.	Helmet and fittings for collection of samples of breath from chickens.....	149
Bibliography		150

Abstract

Feed is the largest single cost factor (60%) in production of chicken meat with cost of energy being a major consideration given that birds eat to satisfy an energy requirement. The Australian chicken meat industry is highly dependent on supply of energy from cereals such as wheat and barley that are known to vary widely in apparent metabolisable energy (AME). In contrast, sorghum is a relatively consistent source of energy.

Diets for broiler chickens are comprised mainly of cereal grains, legumes and protein-rich meals of plant and animal origin. The diets are formulated to provide essential nutrients for maintenance and rapid growth of the flock as a whole. However, some dietary ingredients may also have chemical and physical properties that can be detrimental to the processes of ingestion, digestion, absorption, transport and utilisation of nutrients. Soluble non-starch polysaccharides (NSP) in cereal grains such as wheat and barley can depress digestion of energy by broiler chickens.

This thesis examined the general hypothesis that the effects of soluble NSP in cereal grains on gut structure and function, digesta transit time, and gut microflora differ substantially between individual chickens within a flock, thus contributing to variation in the digestion of energy by the flock as a whole. A major goal of the research was to determine what characteristics of the gastrointestinal tract of broiler chickens were the key determinants of digestion of energy. Twelve experiments were conducted during this study. Breath tests involving measurements of carbon dioxide, hydrogen and methane were developed as non-invasive indicators of digestive function, and were used in conjunction with conventional methods for measuring energy digestion in commercial strains of chickens.

Sex of the chicken had a significant effect ($P < 0.05$) on AME values obtained for a diet based on wheat with a high soluble NSP content. Females were superior to males (14.6 vs 14.0 MJ/kg DM), but strain of chicken had no effect on AME. Villus height and crypt depth in the intestinal epithelium were measured to determine if any relationships between gut morphology and AME could explain why males and females differed. Males had significantly greater ileal villus height than females ($P < 0.05$). In one of the two strains of chickens studied, villus heights in the duodenum and jejunum tended to be greater in males than females ($0.05 < P < 0.10$). In the second strain of chicken, villus heights in the duodenum and ileum were lower ($P < 0.05$) than those in the first strain, with little

differences observed between males and females. Crypt depth was unaffected by strain or by sex of the chickens. Thus, individual measurements of gut morphology were poor indicators of AME. Furthermore, only 33% of the total variation in apparent metabolisable energy (AME) could be accounted for by combinations of measurements of villus height and crypt depth in the duodenal, jejunal and ileal sections of the small intestine. It was concluded that other determinants of digestive capacity were collectively more important than gut morphology.

Energy excretion by male chickens was observed to rise in an exponential manner relative to energy intake, whereas the increase in females was linear. It was reasoned that increased energy excretion by males could be due to increased endogenous energy losses from the distal part of the intestinal tract, reduced production of volatile fatty acids (VFA) by microbial fermentation in the caeca, or reduced absorption of VFA by caeca. These possibilities pointed to the need for a closer examination of the role of gut microbiota on the digestive function of chickens. It was also clear that further studies should differentiate between digestion of energy in the small intestine (by measurement of ileal digestible energy) and whole of tract digestion (by measurement of AME).

Ileal digestible energy (DE) values for wheat and barley were unaffected by sex of chickens, whereas AME values were lower in male chickens compared with females. These results suggested that the sex-specific effects of microbiota occurred mainly in the hindgut. Furthermore, the influence of the gut microbiota on between-bird variation in AME was partially dependent on the type of cereal grain used in the diet, as indicated by the observation that the differential between males and females in expiration of hydrogen and methane in the breath changed according to the type of grain consumed. That is, the metabolic activity of the gut microbiota was influenced both by the sex of the chicken and by the properties of the diet.

The results of these studies provided evidence that microbial colonisation of the gut is a key determinant of the digestive function of chickens. Further work is needed to determine why microbial colonisation of the gut is variable and why it differs substantially between male and female chickens. Then it may be possible to control the initial colonisation of newly hatched chicks and to maintain a health-promoting profile throughout the life of chickens in order to enhance efficient production, and product quality and safety.